

THE
Corrector Corrected :

2

Or, some Sober
REFLECTIONS

On a late BOOK of
Mr. THOMAS DANSON's,
Published by him (as he pretends) to
Correct an immodest and false Account (as
he calls it) of two Conferences between
him and Mr. Ives, formerly Printed about
the Saints Perseverance.

By which the former Accounts of the said
Disputations are Justified,

And Mr. Danson's latter Account justly bla-
med, as being filled with Impertinencies, Rail-
ings, false Accusations, unchristian and un-
manly Reflections upon the Person,
Opinion, and Trade of his
Antagonist.

Evidenced to the Judgment of every Ingenious Reader.

By *Jer. Ives.*

Job 11. 3 *Should thy lyes make men hold their peace ?
And when thou mockest, shall no man make thee
ashamed ?*

Contemptum stulti contempnere maxima laus est ;
Contemni à stulto dedecus esse nego.

London, Printed 1672.

3
2
C
-
-
f
b
w
d
b
e
C
B
w
th
le
fi
C
n



T H E
Corrector Corrected, &c.

IT hath alway been, and still is the Method of the adversaries to Truth, to make Calumnies and Falshood, the greatest part of their offensive Armour; having learned that old Greek advice, *That to Calumniate stoutly, for that how perfectly the wound of reproch be healed, there will remain a scar; and though we wipe away with never so much care the dirt thrown at us, some sallage will be left behinde*: Accordingly this was the Expedient the Pagans used against the Primitive Christians, to put them in the Skins of Beasts, and shapes of Monsters, and then worry them to death. Had this been only the stratagem of Heathens, the wonder had long since ceased: But alas! these Unchristian Weapons have been too much used in Christian Warfare; as if Christianity could not subsist without a Heathenish Auxiliary,

It is sad to observe these Pagan Copies, so often transcribed by Christian Combatants, who though they pretend to advance Truth, yet make Calumny and Falshood their Instruments. Now that these have been the chief Weapons of Mr. *Danson's* Warfare, together with his idle and bald Similitudes, his Illogical Arguing, his giving the go-by to that he could not answer, his notorious falsifying of what was both said and Printed; with which not only his disputing, but his late Book abounds withall; the evincing whereof is the ground of this present Undertaking.

I shall begin with his Calumniating, where-with he begins his Book, telling the Reader in the very beginning of his Epistle, *That I am guilty of such Immorality in Conversation, that they are ashamed of me that do agree with me in Opinion; again, that I am guilty of detestable Arrianisme, and denying the Godhead of Christ, and that I have never repented of it as he knows of; and therefore all Christians by Profession have cause to be ashamed of me, &c.* Upon the whole of this Charge, I shall make these modest Demands.

First, What Mr. *Danson* means by Immorality? For if by Immorality he means a coming short of the strictness of the Moral Law,

Law, which is to love God with all my heart, and my neighbour as my self, I must with the rest of mankind plead guilty; and if this be Mr. *Danſon's* meaning, he should not have thrown the first stone till himself had been without sin: But if by Immorality he means some capital and notorious Crimes, (for that seems to be his meaning, because he saith they are such, for which *those are ashamed of me that agree with me in Opinion*) I here upon demand.

Secondly, Whether Mr. *Danſon* chargeth me with Immorality upon his own knowledge, or upon hear-say and report? If upon his own knowledge, why did he not use means to reclaim me before he did publicly defame me? and instance the particular Acts wherein I was thus guilty, together with the names of his Evidences: If Mr. *Danſon* had this story of my Immorality but upon report, I demand whether it is not gross Immorality, contrary to the Law of God and Nature, not only to take up, but to Print a report or reproch against ones neighbour? It's contrary to the Law of Nature, because Mr. *Danſon* would not be so served himself; contrary to the written Law of God, *Levit.* 19. 16. *Pſal.* 15. 3. *Jer.* 20. 10. *Ezek.* 22. 9. which expressly forbids taking up reports against our neighbour.

Thirdly, I demand whether Mr. *Danson* thinks *George Whitehead* did well to report, and Print in his Book of the Divinity of Christ, *Page 49.* that he was given to gaming, Bowls, and Nine-pins, &c. Yet however *George* was more ingenious; because he instances the particulars of his Charge, and not like Mr. *Danson*, to traduce in general terms, and instance in no particulars. Now if this was ill done in him, thus to report of Mr. *Danson*, surely it cannot be well done of Mr. *Danson*, thus to take up and Print Reports against me.

Fourthly, Whereas Mr. *Danson* saith, that such is my Immortality, that they are ashamed of me that agree with me in opinion; I demand how that can be, when I have conversed this 30. years among those of my own opinion, and with whom I still have my conversation through the Grace of God, whom I dare appeal to in this matter, and who were the men, as Mr. *Danson* confesseth in the 2 *Page* of his Epistle, that did substitute me to dispute with him, though he saith they are ashamed of me.

As to the second part of this charge, that *I am a detestable Arrian, and deny the Godhead of Christ, for which all Christians should be ashamed of me;* this because it is a particular instance, requires a particular

Answer

Answer: I therefore deny that ever I denied the Godhead of Christ; I did never by Word or Writing assert any such thing, but the contrary. and I challenge any man to prove it either from my Words or Writings; for there is no other way of proof that I know of, and to put the matter further out of doubt, and rowl away this reproch. I do profess before God, Angels and Men, that I do believe Jesus Christ to be God blessed for ever, Amen, according to *Rom. 9. 5.* not only my Lord, but my God, *John 20. 28.* And to the truth of this I appeal to all Christians that know me, whether I have not, and do not give Divine Honour and Adoration to Jesus Christ the Son of God, of whom the Author to the *Hebrews* thus speaks, and which I do firmly believe, *Heb. 1. 8. But unto the Son he saith, thy Throne O God is for ever and ever:* Whence it is not only men, but even all the Angels of God are required to Worship him, *Ver. 6.*

Last'y, upon the whole of this charge I demand, whether he that publishes, or reports any one for scandalous and blasphemous, (for such is imorality and denying the Godhead of Christ) and doth not publish his Evidence, ought not justly to be suspected to be the Author of those reports, and the Inventor of those evil things.

After he hath done with this, he begins to beat me with barbarism, telling me that *I out-faced him*, Epist. Page 3. *That I was more bold then wise*; because I sent to him to desire him to appoint time and place to view the Copy of the disputes before I Printed them, Epist. Page 4. Again in Page 49. he saith, *I make no Conscience of lying to shew my Adversary, and that I was rude and clamerous*, and that he could not be heard for my rudeness, Page 40. 50. He reflects upon my Trade, Page 8. calls me *impudence in the height*, Page 58. Tells me *I have a brow of Brass*, Page 84. So in the dispute he called me *ignorant, disingenious, impudent fellow*, see my Book Page 156. 158. and in Page 41. of his Book, he calls me *ignorant, disingenious*, upon the whole I demand of any man that hath not polluted his credit & his Conscience to, whether such words of this Preacher are ever like to Administer Grace to either hearers or readers? whereas he charges me with rude and uncivil behaviour in general terms, I demand whether he hath instanced in all his Book of any one hard word, rude or uncivil expression that fell from my lips in the disputations, or from my Pen in the publishing of them, though often provoked by his ill language. I challenge envy it self to give me an instance
anp

and yet this man complains of my rudeness, and in his Epistle Page 2. confidently tells his Reader, *that those that were absent knew how I demean'd myself as perfectly as they that were present* : Surely he thinks all that know me have a Spirit of Divination, else they could never know my behaviour, *as PERFECTLY* in their absence, as if they were present with me, and to make me amends ; for all this he tells his Reader in his Epistle Page 6. that he forbears to enlarge ; *because it would but give the world a sight of rudeness and impertinency in their natural deformity*. Now the man thinks I must thank him for his favour, but I shall only say, *stulorum gratia in grata*. He complains Page 65. that *he could not be heard for my Stentorian voice*, a hard word, which he found in some of his Boys Dictionaries, taken from a *Gracian*, whose name was *Stentor*, who with his voice, it's said, would make a greater noise then 50. men together, such a voice I have, if you will believe Mr. *Danson*, thus this mans Tongue doth traduce by instinct, and is so venomous that it cannot touch unless it sting, and his Pen drops a train of sly and malicious words, and that (he thinks) is enough to blow up any ones reputation by this Art (as one well observes) *Men are wounded with doubtful intimations, and stab'd with an oblique*

like look, it is but raising suspicions, and an indifferent Logician will find out the Catagorical meanings of those oblique reprochings, and as if Slinders lay point blank with the level of his Genus he begins to sow this Seed in the morning of his Book, and in the evening of it this hand doth not rest; he saith in the close of his Book, *That there is not a ruder sort of people (the quakers not excepted) then the Arminian Anabaptists, & this he says is the common opinion that sober persons have of them,* thus you see that one person is too mean a prey, for his great Spirit to quarry upon, a whole party is little enough to fall by his fatal blows, thus as with the Jaw bone of an Ass heaps upon heaps we fall by thousands, I shall close this with a sober saying of Dr. Sibbs upon the Canticles Page 285. *This (saith he) is a thing that springs from the poisonous pride of mens hearts, that when they cannot raise themselves by their own worth they will endeavour to do it by the ruining anothers credit.* Thus Mr. Crandon, Mr. Eyres, Mr. Bagshaw, deals with Mr. Baxter, the former by solemnly accusing him in print for a *Papist*, and the second by charging him also in Print, that when he writ against *Antinomians*, that he meant *Antipapists*, and that he was a *Socinian*, and a *Papist*, and a *Fesuit*, so confession of Faith, Page 6. the latter

latter, viz. Mr. Bagshaw accuseth him for one of the worst sort of Hereticks; Bagshaw Defence of the Antidote, in his Advertisement at the latter end of the Book: And this way the Jesuits went to defame Luther and Calvin, by spreading it abroad, *that they denied the Majesty of God, and the Deity of Christ.* This way Mr. Edwards in his *Gangrena* took to bespatter all persons whose Opinions he could not confute; and this way Mr. Danson takes to bespatter me, as if his design were more to blast his Adversaries Fame, then to confute his Errours; and for the better effecting of it, his Book abounds with uncouth and bald Similitudes, thereby to affect the ears of the vulgar, whose temper is aptly suited to receive ill impressions.

In page 57. of his Book, when he could not reply to the force of my Answer, he instead of rejoyning, tells his Reader, that *my Answer did me no more service, then a Mouse struggling to get out of a Tar-barrel*; and in his Epistle, page 2. as if he had lately been at a Cock-fighting, he saith, *If he should not have disputed, I would have crowed like a Cock on a Dunghill*; but to whom this similitude is best applied, may easily be discerned: for when I sent a Letter to Mr. Danson, to tell him I could not meet at the

time he appointed me, and to which I never agreed, yet this man sent me word in a Letter, that he would not alter the time, (though of his own appointing) but accordingly met (if I may use his phrase) upon his own Dunghill, viz. the place of his own appointing, where he took the liberty to crow, sufficiently knowing before that there would be none to oppose him. He further addes, as if he had been at a Fencing-School, that if he had not disputed, *my party would have gone away singing, IO TRIUMPHE*: And in page 6. of his Epistle, as if he had lately been at the Bear-Garden, he comes in with his Bearish Similitude, and tell me, *That like the Bear I licked my Cubs into a better shape then they had at their Birth*. Sure this is barbarous English for a Schollar to talk of the *Birth of Bears*: Again, in his Epistle page 5. he saith *I made him father my brats*. Is not this rich Rhetorick? But his stock of Similitudes being all exhausted, he goes a borrowing of a greazy one of Dr. Tho. Goodwin, as himself confesseth in his Book, page 37. by which he would compare the increase of Grace to making of Candles; *When a Candle (saith he) is put into a Fat of boyled Tallow, every time it is put in, it comes out bigger and bigger, &c.* Really it argues a man hath but a little Learning, and a very barren

barren Wit that must go a borrowing for such sorry Similitudes: Thus you see he loves to disport himself with Tropes, Metaphors, and Similitudes. But to proceed, his Logick corresponds with his Rhetorick; for if it be true as he saith, (then which nothing is more false) that I did not rightly lay down some two or three of his Arguments in his own terms; and if it were true, that sometimes I deny'd the *major* when the Syllogism was Hypothetical, and therefore should have denied the Consequence rather; suppose all this that he corrects me for, were deservedly to be corrected, yet that which he doth not deny when I accuse him of it, I hope that may be taken for granted, (and that his silence herein, according to the Proverb, may well be interpreted for consent) and then let the Reader but consider how often I charged him in the Dispute with begging the Question, instead of proving it with attempting to make Arguments several times one after another, and could not for a long time conclude the Question; see page 84. to 91. of my Book: And did not I in the Disputation thrice appeal to his Friend Mr. *Fowler*, who also gave it against him? which did not satisfie him, but still he would have argued without concluding the Question in debate. See page 94. how often did I charge

charge him with running in a Ring, and disputing circularly, and of false Syllogisms, arguing *idem per idem*, to all which he makes no defence, but saith page 43. I wrong'd him by saying, he argued that what ever was potential hath been done; yet as if the man and his senses were parted, he confesseth he argued, that if Believers can fall away, some have; and that he did argue *a posse ad esse*, which is in English the same thing; therefore I conclude, that he being conscious of the Truth of what I charged him withall, he thought it the best way to pass it over in silence, as he doth those Quotations out of St. *Austin*, where I shew beyond contradiction, that not onely he, but *Prosper* and *Fulgentius*, and the Church of God for thirteen or fourteen hundred years were of my mind touching the Point in Question; which he makes no reply to, though this was stily denied in the Disputation.

Again, page 43. of my Book, I charge him with taking up my Interpretation of the first of *John* to confute the *Quakers*, when he discoursed with them; and with taking up the *Quakers* Interpretation of the same Text, to confute me, as any man may see, that compareth 42, 43, 44, 45. of my Book, with page 3, 4. & 6. 36. & 44. of his Book called *The Quakers folly*, much like those

those fraudulent Chapmen, that have one weight to buy by, and another to sell by. Now he in his late Book, instead of answering so material an Objection, tells the Reader page 9. *that it is so trivial, that it deserves a smile rather than an answer*: An easie way to answer Objections, which was a frequent humour in Mr. *Danson*, and many others of his way then present at the Disputation, to fall a laughing and scoffing, on purpose to animate the people in so doing; see my Book page 114, 115. for no other reason, but because I told them that the Seed of God, 1 *John* 2. might be understood for the Word of God, according as Christ interprets the phrase, *Mat.* 13. And though I blamed him and them in their Disputations for their Levity; yet he neither denies the Charge, nor makes any other Defence. But I understand that this is not the first time that he and his party hath been charged with it; *George Whitehead* in Print complaining of it, in his Account of the Disputations between him and Mr. *Danson*, though I confess Mr. *Danson* saith more for himself in his reply to *George Whitehead*, then his conscience would suffer him to say in his reply to me, *viz.* that he did speak several times to still the people of his Perswasion when he disputed with the *Quakers*; though

though he would never open his lips upon that account, in his disputing with me; though he saw me take so much pains to intreat those of his party to be silent and civil.

Likewise when I charge him with saying, he could not prove his *major* Proposition, page 84. so great was the straight he was then in, that he is not yet out of it; for else we should have heard him say something for himself in his Reply, but not a word of this.

Another main thing he gives the go-by, is my charging his Doctrine with Novelty, and to symbolize with Antinomianism, to those many Instances I bring of the Antiquity of the contrary Opinion, quoted by Mr. Baxter out of St. Austin, and others, he saith nothing, but quotes Dr Kendall, *Hier. Zanch* See his Book page 80, 81 but not a word what they say; and further tell us, that St. Austin writ a Book *de persev. Sant.* and distinguisheth often between common and special grace: But what is this to the purpose? Dath this take off the force of what St. Austin saith about the possibility of true Believers falling away, (which I urged in my Book once and again, and he saith nothing to it) and to what I alledg'd out of Mr. Baxter, he saith page 81. *that*
worthy

worthy person doth not determine against what he holds ; What a piece of impertinency is here? Do not I say once and again, page 173, 175. that though it was not Mr. *Baxter*, own perswasion, yet he confesseth it was the perswasion of the Church of God for thirteen or fourteen hundred years ; and for this Mr. *Baxter* quotes good Authority, which instead of taking off, he saith not a word to, onely tells his Reader what I told him before, that Mr. *Baxter* dissents from me. But what is this to the purpose, unless I had charged Mr. *Baxter* with being of my Opinion.

But the Antient Churches, as well as Modern, which I do say were of my mind, Mr. *Danson* hath no mind to meddle with ; and whereas I do charge their Doctrine to symbolize with Antinomianism in many particular Instances, too plain to be deny'd ; instead of taking off those Instances, he brings in Mr. *Carril*, to whom he saith he subscribes, which, saith he, speaks the sense of them, (meaning of those men whose Books I quote) see his Book page 81. where he quotes these passages from Mr. *Carril*, on of his Comment upon these words, *Job 10. 15. If I be wicked, woe unto me, &c.* They (saith he) put dangerous suppositions contrary to this, that say, *Let a godly man be never so wicked, let him sin as much as he will, yet it shall be well with him* [this saith Mr. *Dan-*

on is the language of such as Dr. Crisp, which Mr. Ives quotes, and we disown] and then he adds, though there be a truth in it, that how much soever a godly man sinneth he shall be pardoned. For the unriddling this Riddle, I must make these enquiries.

First, Whether it be not as dangerous a supposition to suppose that if a godly man sin never so much, he shall be pardoned, as to suppose that if a godly man be never so wicked, it shall be well with him, since the latter of these Mr. Carril and Mr. Danson both say is contrary to what Job supposeth; but the former they say hath a truth in it.

Secondly, Since Mr. Danson saith, that it is the language of such as Dr. Crisp to say, that let a godly man sin never so much it shall be well with him, which (saith he) is the language which we disown; yet withall he adds, that there is a truth in it, that how much soever a godly man sins he shall be pardoned; whereupon I demand how Mr. Danson can disown it, and in the next Sentence say there is a truth in it?

Thirdly, I demand how it can be a dangerous supposition, and yet a true supposition? To suppose that if a godly man sins never so much he shall be pardoned; for he saith there is a truth in it, and yet saith it is dangerous; but what danger is there to assert and believe a truth, unless it be a danger to Mr. Danson's reputation when his people shall per-

perceive him so palpably contradictory to himself?

Fourthly, Whereas Mr. Carril and Mr. Danson (both say) that there is a truth in that supposition, *that how much soever a godly man sins he shall be pardoned*; and yet in the next words tells us, *that the Scripture useth no such language*. And Mr. Carril (upon the same place in *Job*) saith, *The Spirit of God makes no such supposition; and the form of wholesome words, teacheth every man rather to speak thus, if I am wicked woe unto me*: Hence I demand how there can be a truth in any divine Doctrine which is not the language of holy Scripture? No marvel Mr. Danson was angry, and called me a *conceited ignorant Fellow*, when I called upon him for a plain Text to prove his Doctrine; see my Book, page 156. since he saith there is a truth in this Doctrine, though (he saith) *it be not the language of the Scripture, nor according to the form of wholesome words*.

He that can resolve these questions, and can reconcile such palpable contradictions, shall be my *magnus Apollo* (*viz.*) that a Doctrine can be dangerous and contrary to what *Job* speaks, and yet true, a supposition as the Spirit of God no where supposeth, and which is not found in the language of holy Scripture, and form of wholesome words, and yet true; and which Mr. Danson himself saith he disowns, and yet after all this saith,

there is a truth in it ! When Mr. *Danſon* hath reconciled theſe Sentences, I will have them advanced into the number of *Orthodox paradoxes*. But what is all this to the matter objected in page 104 of my book (viz.) that Mr. *Danſon* ſaith in his book of the *Quakers folly*, page 38. *That David when he was guilty of Murder and Adultery, was not in a condemned, but a juſtified ſtate* ; This though I charge him with it once and again ; yet like a man afraid or aſhamed, he paſſeth by it, and ſaith nothing at all to it ; and whereas I charge others of them (in divers of their books which I refer to in my Appendix) with ſaying *the regenerate dye in Chriſt, though they dye in impenitency ; and that the people of God need not queſtion their condition, though their ſins be never ſo great ; and that God loved the Corinthians in their Adulteries, Idolatries, and ungodlyneſs, as much as when they were believers, waſhed, juſtified, and ſanctified. And that it is not the manner of Gods people to confeſs and forſake their ſin in order to Salvation, and that they that cannot preach men ſins are forgiven, till they ſee them repent and reform their lives, are ignorant preachers, and that no ſin any true believer can commit, can move God to hate them, neither will God love them ever a whit the worſe, though they commit never ſo many and ſo great ſins ;* Theſe are the Antinomian notions I charge Mr. *Danſon* and divers of his Brethren with-

all,

all, of which charge he in his book promised to clear them. See his Epistle to his book, page 6. But I think they will never give him thanks for his labour, when they shall find that he takes no notice of all these pernicious doctrines, asserted by them, and charged upon them, as any one may see that reads his book; but instead of clearing them, brings Mr. Carril to speak the same thing for them all, by which he confirms the whole charge, (*viz.*) that if a godly man sins never so much, it shall be forgiven him, though the Scripture (saith he) useth no such language. But if this godly man have not sinned himself out of his senses, he will never believe such Ministers that tell them of pardons that are not to be found in the Scriptures, nor supposed by the spirit of God, as Mr. Carril and Mr. Danson confesseth; see Mr. Carril upon Job 10. 16. and Mr. Danson subscribing to him in his book page 81.. Sure I am a little ticket from Rome (as one calls it) will as soon assure a godly man of pardon, though he sins never so much (as Mr. Danson can assure him in the like case, if such doctrines are not the language of holy Scripture) For would not this be a wonderful Cordial to a godly man in an hour of desertion and temptation, to tell him that he need not be cast down, for though he hath sinned never so much against God he shall be pardoned; and to assure him of the truth of this comfortable Doctrine,

tell him Mr. *Danſon* ſaith, and Mr. *Carril* ſaith, *there is a truth in it, though it be not the language of holy Scripture.* Were it not much better for this godly man to ſend for a Romiſh Prieſt, and take abſolution from him; for in ſo doing he ſhall have the Faith of their Church for his aſſurance, though he hath no word of God for it, and I think that as good, if not better, then the aſſurance of ſuch pardons Mr. *Danſon* talks of, which he ſaith are not found in the language of holy Scripture.

Other aninomian paſſages he hath, p. 32. 33. which like the Papiſts he accounts for truth, though they are not found in the language of the holy Scripture, (*viz.*) that *David* in his committing Murder, and Adultry, did never wickedly depart from God; and to prove this, he ſuborns the 18th. *Pſalm* for a witneſs, where *David* ſays, *I have not wickedly departed from God*: whence he infers, that *David* never wickedly departed from him. but whoever conſiders 2 *Sam* 22. ſhall find that *David* likewise ſaith, *that he did not depart from Gods ſtatutes*, and *Pſal.* 119. v. 101, 102. *I have (ſaith David) refrained my feet from every evil way, and I have not departed from thy judgments.* May not a man as well argue that *David* never ſinned, becauſe he ſaith, *I have refrained my feet from every evil way*, and that he had never departed from Gods ſtatutes becauſe he ſaith, *I have not departed from them*, as ſay as Mr. *Danſon* ſaith, that becauſe *David* ſays,

says, *I have not wickedly departed from God*, that therefore he never wickedly departed from him; For by the same parity of reason that *David* did not wickedly depart from God in the committing Murder, and Adultery; because he says, *I have not wickedly departed from God*: I say by the same reason he did not sin in committing Murder, and Adultery; because the Scripture likewise says in the fore-cited places, that he had refrained his feet from every evil way.

Again, we have more of this Antinomian Spirit moving upon the Superficies of the 30th. and 31st p. of his book, in words at length and not in figures, he saith, *though Christ might justify a divorce; yet it appears not that he will sue out one against any believer that is guilty of bodily Adultery.*

This is the man that tells his Reader in his Epistle, p. 6. *that he will vindicate their doctrine from the charge of Antinomianism, and that he disowns the language of such as Dr. Crisp, &c. p. 88.*

Now in p. 195. of my book, I quote Dr. Crisp in his Sermon of *Christ is the way*, saying, *that if a believer be overtaken with a gross sin, none dare serve a writ of Damnation upon him.*

And though Mr. Danson would make his Reader believe, he disowns Dr. Crisp &c. yet he saith the same thing; for he saith, *Christ will not sue out a divorce against a believer, though guilty of bodily Adultery.* Dr. Crisp saith,

faith, none can serve a Writ of Damnation upon them, though they are guilty of gross sins. Thus you may see how Mr. *Danson* clears himself of Antomianism, and disowns Dr. *Crisps* Language; just like him that to clear himself of worshipping the similitude of the Virgin *Mary*, and to disown any such charge said, that he did not worship her similitude; but he worshipped her likeness; after this rate doth Mr. *Danson* disown Dr. *Crisp*, and Antinomianism.

I now proceed to answer his false charges touching our conferences, which I doubt not but I shall discharge my self of in the judgment of all impartial persons, at a better rate then Mr. *Danson* hath cleared himself of Antomianism.

The two main things he charges my book, with is, omissions of many things that past in the Disputes; and asserting some things to have been spoken by him, that he never spoke.

To this I answer, First, that I did not write out the Disputes my self; but they were writ out by a person that is neither Presbyterian, nor Anabaptist, who took both days conferences in Characters; and had no reason that I know of, to be partial; and who is ready if need be to attest upon Oath, that those things were asserted by Mr. *Danson* in the conferences which he denies in his book; among which, this is one passage, in page 83. of my book, (*viz.*) *that whatever is potential hath been done*

done: this Mr. *Danſon* in the 43d p. of his book ſaith, *were not his but my words*

But beſides what may be evidenced by him that writ the Diſpute, that theſe were Mr. *Danſons* words; I offer the conſideration of what is publiſhed in p 83, 84. of my book, where this very propoſition of Mr. *Danſons*, was more largely debated him, and I preſſed him to the proof of it, to that height, that he was forced to answer *he could not prove it*; as any may ſee that reads my book p. 84 and which he doth not ſo much as deny in any part of his own book.

But further, to ſhew my ſincerity in this matter, and that I did no way deſign to abuſe Mr. *Danſon*, or the World with falſities; I writ to him to appoint me time and place when and where I might meet with him, that he might have liberty to correct the Copy, that it might be publiſhed by conſent, the Copy of which Letter is printed in my Book, and confeſſed by Mr. *Danſon* in the 4. Page of the Epistle to his Book, and for which he tells me *I was more bold then wiſe*. Now let all ingenious men judge whether my thus ſending to him to come and view the Copy, and correct it if need were, did beſpeak me to be a perſon that intended to miſrepreſent him, and whether his reſuſing to meet me upon ſo fair an invitation, and upon ſo juſt an occaſion, doth not rather beſpeak him too conſcious of his own folly, and therefore was unwilling to meet, leaſt he ſhould
have

have been contributory to the manifestation of it

Besides (as Mr. *Danson* deridingly tells his Reader once and again) I had all my Arguments written in my Note Book, and so might be better capable to correct any error in the Scribe. then Mr. *Danson*, who was so far from having Arguments in his hand, that at some turns he had none in his head, but sometimes when he was right in his Premises, he was out in his Conclusion, and other whiles when he concluded the thing denied, his Premises was false, from whence he would infer it ; this I have charged him with several times, which was so manifest, that he durst not in this matter plead not guilty in all his Book, and therefore I leave any to judge, whose Judgments are not forestalled, whether (these Circumstances considered) I have added any thing to the conferences, or imputed any thing to Mr. *Danson*, but what in truth he is chargeable with.

But I have an Argument yet more convincing, to prove he chargeth me falsely ; because he complains that I have left out of my Book divers things to the weakening his Arguments and Answers, that I might render him ridiculous. Now that man as shall be so daringly bold as to tell his Reader once and again, that I have left that out of my Book which is plainly and expressly in it, may be justly suspected to speak falsely in other things, and that he charges me falsely in this matter, appears,

First, In Page 2. of his Book, he saith, the
term

term *true believers* was not in the minor proposition denied. Now whoever looks into the 2. and 3. Page of my Book shall see it is both implied and exprest, besides he expresth it in his own Book in his repetition of the Argument, Page 2, and yet he saith, *the term true believers was not in the minor proposition*. I see the Proverb is true that A—— must have a good memory; for he reports the words in his own account he gives of the dispute, and presently after saith those words were not in the Arguments.

Secondly, He saith Page 2 that in my account of the conference, I left out *his distinction of what was impossible to be done, by reason of the Divine decree, or promise, though otherwise possible, [with respect to the nature of the thing]* all this (saith he) Mr. Ives left out.

When I have not only put it all in; but have added a Paraphrase upon that distinction in a different Character, and that I have put in this distinction in my answers, appears in the 27 Page of my Book, where you have me speaking to Mr. Danson in these words. *You gave this distinction that the command was possible in it self, or in relation to the subject commanded, but not possible with respect to the decree of God.*

And in a few lines following, I Print Mr. Danson repling in these words. *I said that those Cautions that are given to visible believers in general, that they should take heed of falling away,*
did

did suppose the possibility of it in the nature of the thing (in true believers also) because man is but mutable, and Grace is but a Creature, and therefore certainly may be lost, and yet it is certainly impossible as to true believers upon the supposition of the Divine decree, and Christ promise to preserve and uphold the Grace of true believers, to which I subjoyn in a different Character as a further Answer upon his distinction, this is just as if a man should say the whole earth is possible to be overflowed with Water, with respect to the Nature of the thing, though with respect to the decree of God it is impossible, but then I add, that if God hath made such a decree, no man hath any more reason to fear a universal inundation, because of such a decree, then he had to fear it if it were impossible, with respect to the nature of the thing, in like manner if it be impossible to fall from Grace with respect to the decree of God, there is no more reason to fear falling then there would have been, had it been impossible with respect to the nature of the thing. Thus I not only mention his distinction, but takes pains to argue it of in Page 27 and 28. of my Book, and yet this man hath the confidence to tell his Reader in Page 2. of his Book, that I left it out, and relate only his denial of the Major.

Thirdly, A third omission he chargeth me with is that in my Book, I left all the explication (he gave) of inlightning which he infered from 1 John 5. Luke 4. 1. how that all inlightning was not a Character

rather of true believers unless the Devil, be a true believer; See his Book Page 10. Now that this is a notorious falsity any one may see, that reads my Book, Page 46. 47. in which Pages I bring in Mr. Danson, thus answering upon this distinction. *A person (saith he) may be so far enlightened (and not a true believer) as to assent to this proposition that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, 1 John 5. compared with Luke 4 4. here are both the Texts that he grounds the distinction, and the explication it self, and then in Page 47. I bring him in giving a further explication of himself in these words. I have shewen you (saith he) that persons may be so far enlightened, as to believe that Jesus is the Christ, as the Devils themselves did, yet (he saith Page 10.) all this explication of enlightning I have omitted, if men can speak falsely at such a wilful rate, they deserve not to be credited when they speak the truth.*

Fourthly, He saith I omitted his Argument of the 1. John 3. 9. *Whosoever is born of God cannot sin, &c.* see his Book P. 47. Now see my Book Page 101, 102, 103. where I bring in Mr. Danson, not only quoting the Text, but inferring from it several times that believers cannot sin as wicked men do, as any may see that reads my book, where I express and repeat his Arguments with all his improvements of it, and yet this man saith I have omitted it.

Fifthly, He saith *my dissingenuity is remarkable, that I leave out the word Spiritual, which*
(saith

(saith he) I did often, perhaps not always add as a limitation of the promises made to Israel; See his book p. 56.

Here Mr. Danson chargeth me with an *Emphasis*, not onely for being *disingenious*, but adds, that I am remarkably *disingenious* for leaving out the word *Spiritual*, in his argument on Jer. 32. But Mr. Danson is the more remarkably dishonest for falsifying my book, and abusing his Reader, that perhaps may never compare both books together, for this very word *Spiritual* I mention six times in 5 pages one after another, as spoken by Mr. Danson by which he limits the promise in the 32^d of Jer. as made to *Israel* in things *spiritual*; and yet Mr. Danson is so carnal as to say, I am remarkably *disingenious* for leaving it out; for proof hereof, read my book p. 131. where you will find, I charge him for running in a Ring, and disputing circularly; and therefore pray him to prove the promises in Jer. 32. are made to all true believers: then I bring in Mr. Danson, giving this answer, IN SPIRITUAL THINGS saith he, here I mention the word the first time, again, I mention it the second time in page 132. where I charge him with saying, *Whatever is predicated of all the Israel of God, is predicated of all true believers*; to this I bring in Mr. Danson. giving this answer, I told you (saith he) IN SPIRITUAL THINGS. The third time I mention it, is in p. 132. That there

there may be some promises made to the Israel of God, that are not appropriated to all true believers ; I bring Mr. Danson in using this limitation, I say (saith he) as to SPIRITUAL blessings ; I mention him using the same phrase a fourth time in the same forecited p. 133. this clause (saith he) I will put my fear in their hearts, IS SPIRITUAL, my argument (saith he) lies in that ; the fifth time I mention the word, is in p. 134. of my book, there I bring in Mr. Danson speaking thus, I bring this Text (saith he) to prove that the phrase the Israel of God, comprehends all true believers ; because (saith he) that the promise that is here made is SPIRITUAL. A 6th. time I mention the word, is in p. 135. of my book, where I tell him, he is to conclude that all the promises that are made to the Israel of God, are made to all true believers : To this I bring in Mr. Danson, giving this answer, I say (saith he) it is the promise in SPIRITUAL things.

I have put this word *Spiritual* in Capitals, that all may see he is as capitally Criminal in depraving my Writings, both in the words, and very letter of them, as he is in defaming my person : for every passage that threatens danger to his cause must be mutilated and dismembered ; and as *Sampson* was by the *Philistines*, lose its hair and eyes, and then (as one well observes upon the same occasion) be made sport for the whole party.

6y Mr. Danson accuseth me in p. 49 of his book for saying, that the promise of the Land of Canaan had

no condition expressed or implied in all the Scripture, which is notoriously false; for it was onely a stranger that was at the Dispute, that did accuse me for saying so: but I presently convinced him of his mistake: for which he publicly craved my pardon, as I relate it in my book, 122. and which is not denied by Mr. Danson; and yet he mounts upon confidence, and says I said so.

7ly. Whereas in my Appendix I charge Mr. Danson, and divers other Ministers; for making one heart with Dr. Crisp, by their publishing Antinomian notions, that tend to Rantism: Mr. Danson replies, *that how smooth'y soever I think to carry it, Dr. Crisp speaks of the Elect; but the other Divines speak of Believers; See his book, p. 82. But this is as false as the rest; for I sometimes bring in Dr. Crisp, applying these notions to Believers, as well as they see my book, p. 195. none (saith he) dare serve a writ of Damnation on a Believer, though he shou'd be overtaken with gross sins; and some of those other Divines, as he calls them, applies the like sayings to the Elect, as well (if not as ill) as Dr. Crisp, for Mr. Eyres (whom Dr. Owen commendeth, and whom I quote in my book, p. 196. (saith, that the Elect Corinthians had no more right to Heaven after they believed, then they had in the midst of their Fornicators, Thieves, and Extortions; And yet this man tells his Reader a story as if it were Dr. Crisp that applied these sayings to the Elect; their Ministers understood them of Believers.*

There are many more of this kind, which I forbear to name, knowing that these instances may serve sufficiently to shew all sober Christians what spirit inspired him in inditing this book, which though it consists of six sheets of Paper, about 3 of those sheets are spent in creating new Arguments and Answers, that he confesseth were not urged in the Dispute; all which will shew that he hath better skill to answer Arguments of his own making than mine: But I shall leave the Reader to judge whether Mr. Danson hath sufficiently answered my Arguments, or proved his own, by comparing the books together.

s
-
-
r
o
c
c
s
o
tr.
r
-
is
fe
m

ar
af.
ed
of
nt
n.
ill
of
he
ly
m-